

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

CALLSTAT SOLUTIONS LLC,

Plaintiff,

V.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 6:22-cv-00065

PATENT CASE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Callstat Solutions LLC (“Plaintiff” and/or “Callstat”), through its attorneys, complains of Qualcomm Incorporated (“Defendant” and/or “Qualcomm”) for infringement of United States Patent Nos. 6,137,789 (hereinafter “the ‘789 Patent”) and 6,510,148 (hereinafter “the ‘148 Patent”), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Callstat Solutions LLC is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 261 West 35th St, Suite 1003, New York, NY 10001.

2. Defendant Qualcomm Incorporated is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains an established place of business at 9600 N. Mopac, Suite 900, Stonebridge Plaza II, Austin, Texas 78759.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendant may be served through its agent, The Prentice-Hall Corporation System, Inc., at Corporate Trust Center, 251 Little Falls Drive, Wilmington, DE 19808.

JURISDICTION

4. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

5. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in this District. As described below, Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.

VENUE

7. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendant has an established place of business in this District. In addition, Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement in this District, and Plaintiff has suffered harm in this district.

PATENTS-IN-SUIT

8. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent Nos. 6,137,789; and 6,510,148 (the “Patents-in-Suit”); including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the Patents-in-Suit. Accordingly, Plaintiff possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patents-in-Suit by Defendant.

THE '789 PATENT

9. The '789 Patent is entitled “Mobile station employing selective discontinuous transmission for high speed data services in CDMA multi-channel reverse link configuration,”

and issued 2000-10-24. The application leading to the '789 Patent was filed on 1997-06-26. A true and correct copy of the '789 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

THE '148 PATENT

10. The '148 Patent is entitled "Selective discontinuous transmission for high speed data services in CDMA multi-channel configuration," and issued 2003-01-21. The application leading to the '148 Patent was filed on 2000-10-23. A true and correct copy of the '148 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '789 PATENT

11. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

12. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant directly infringed one or more claims of the '789 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringed at least the exemplary claims of the '789 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the "Exemplary '789 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringed the claims of the '789 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

13. Defendant also directly infringed, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary '789 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

14. Exhibit 3 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '789 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products

practice the technology claimed by the '789 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '789 Patent Claims.

15. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 3.

16. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

COUNT 2: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '148 PATENT

17. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

18. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant directly infringed one or more claims of the '148 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringed at least the exemplary claims of the '148 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the "Exemplary '148 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringed the claims of the '148 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

19. Defendant also directly infringed, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary '148 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

20. Exhibit 4 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '148 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the '148 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '148 Patent Claims.

21. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 4.

22. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

JURY DEMAND

23. Under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the following relief:

- A. A judgment that the '789 Patent is valid and enforceable
- B. A judgment that Defendant has infringed directly one or more claims of the '789 Patent;
- C. A judgment that the '148 Patent is valid and enforceable
- D. A judgment that Defendant has infringed directly one or more claims of the '148 Patent;
- E. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;
- F. A judgment that awards Plaintiff all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's past infringement at least with respect to the '789; and '148 Patents.
- G. And, if necessary, to adequately compensate Plaintiff for Defendant's infringement, an accounting;

- i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Plaintiff be awarded its reasonable attorneys fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
- ii. that Plaintiff be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in prosecuting this action; and
- iii. that Plaintiff be awarded such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: January 18, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jay Johnson
JAY JOHNSON
State Bar No. 24067322
D. BRADLEY KIZZIA
State Bar No. 11547550
KIZZIA JOHNSON, PLLC
1910 Pacific Ave., Suite 13000
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 451-0164
Fax: (214) 451-0165
jay@kjpllc.com
bkizzia@kjpllc.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF